DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 417 485 EA 028 951

AUTHOR Duncan, P. Kay; Skarstad, Kirsten
TITLE How Women Administrators Are Perceived by Others: A Case Study Examining the Relationship between Leadership Temperament, Use of Power, and Success.
PUB DATE 1995-10-13
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 11-14, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Females; Higher Education; *Leadership Styles; Personality Traits; *Power Structure; *School Administration; Self Concept; *Sex Stereotypes; *Women Administrators
IDENTIFIERS *Gender Issues

ABSTRACT

Research indicates that others' perceptions of the success of a woman administrator are related to whether the woman fits into the range of expected behavior for women in our society, including the way in which she wields power. To explore this phenomenon, this study examined the leadership temperament of the woman administrator and how it interacts positively or negatively with the manner in which she exercises power. A reflective, collaborative, and hermeneutical process was used to infer a relationship between the leadership temperament of five women, the manner in which they used power, and the perceptions of others relative to the women's success and acceptance. Each of the women gave a definition of success, and all of them described characteristics from four temperaments--catalyst, visionary, stabilizer, troubleshooter--as those characteristics needed for a woman administrator to be considered successful. Results also established a connection between the "power over" and the "power to" dichotomy and the four leadership temperament styles of the women. It is suggested that no one can possess all four of the characteristics that were identified as necessary to be a successful leader. Contains 29 references. (RJM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 417 485

EA

# How Women Administrators Are Perceived By Others:

# A Case Study Examining the Relationship Between Leadership Termperament, Use of Power, and Success

P. Kay Duncan, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Division of Educational Administration
Campus Box 4037
The Teachers College
Emporia State University
Emporia, KS 66801-5087
316-341-5778
FAX: 316-341-5785
Duncanpk@esumail.emporia.edu

Kirsten Skarstad, Ph. D.
Assistant Professor
Division of Teacher Education
Campus Box 4037
The Teachers College
Emporia State University
Emporia, KS 66801-5087
316-341-5771
FAX: 316-341-5785
Skarstak@esumail.emporia.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

Mid-Western Educational Research Association

13 October 1995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Kay Duncan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA028951

How Women Administrators Are Perceived By Others: A Case Study Examining the Relationship Between Success, Use of Power and Leadership Temperament


## Abstract

Part of the definition of success or effectiveness for a leader includes whether or not group members accept the leader and whether or not there is positive morale, satisfaction and motivation among group members. These factors rest on the perceptions of others about the leader. Much of existing research indicates that others' perceptions of the success of a woman administrator are strongly related to whether or not the woman fits into the range of expected behavior for women in our society, including the way she wields power. Women administrators are more readily accepted and deemed successful if they follow certain culturally mediated norms. This descriptive, qualitative field study analyzes the leadership temperament of the woman administrator and how it interfaces positively or negatively with the manner in which she wields power in her job and how she is viewed by others. A reflective, collaborative, and hermeneutical process was used to infer a relationship between the leadership temperament of the five women studied, the manner in which they wielded power, and the perceptions of others relative to their success and acceptance.

How Women Administrators Are Perceived By Others : A Case Study Examining the Relationship Between Leadership Temperament, Use of Power, and Success

*She had that indefinable beauty that comes from happiness, enthusiasm, success--a beauty that is nothing more or less than a harmony of temperament and circumstances.*

*Gustave Flaubert, Madame Bovary (1857)*

The women presented in this paper hold positions of power and success. A previous study of these five women central office administrators (Duncan & Rathmel, 1995) revealed however, that each woman was perceived to possess different amounts of power and success by those with whom they worked. The results of that study seemed to demonstrate that the women were perceived differently chiefly because of the way in which they wielded power. Additionally, these perceptions appeared to be mediated by the environment of the district in which the women were administrators.

We were curious. Were there any other reasons why the women administrators who wielded "power over"[1] were described as "barracuda woman," "obnoxious," "overcompensating," "aggressive," "short on people skills," "controlling mother figure?" Were there other reasons why the lone woman described as "power to"[2] seemed to be more favorably regarded than the other four women in the study? Were there perhaps temperament types, which when possessed by women leaders, contributed to the stereotypical perceptions of others? Could we find out?

This study was designed and carried out because we had questions about the importance of leadership temperament as it interacts with others' perceptions of power and success in women administrators. Since we already had collected extensive interview data from the five women central office administrators, we decided to examine their temperament against the backdrop of that previous data.

**The Question**

Specifically, we wondered if we would find a relationship between the way the women wield power and their temperament type. We also wondered if their temperament type would appear to influence whether or not people considered them to be successful and effective. Therefore, this study was designed to explore the particular question: Is there a relationship between the temperament type of women administrators and their colleagues' perceptions of their success based on "power to" or "power over" attributes?

**Gender, Power, and Success**

In an increasingly complex world it becomes ever more difficult for public school administrators to meet the multiple demands of the job, reach their own goals for success, and at the same time be considered by others as successful. The expectations for administrators are high and varied. Many researchers agree that it is even more problematic for women than for men to be deemed successful as administrators (Shakeshaft, 1986; Langford, 1993; Brunner and Duncan, 1994; Duncan and Rathmel, 1995; Morrison et al, 1992; Northcutt, 1991).

There are many definitions of success. According to Webster's dictionary (1993), success is a favorable or desired outcome, the attainment of wealth, favor, or eminence. Although success is often subjectively defined by individual persons and can include idiosyncratic examples, the expectation is that there is likely to be a large degree of consensus among people about what are successful attainments and who are successful persons. In fact, the perceptions of others are key indicators of success in several theories of leader effectiveness. Such indicator-perceptions include group morale, satisfaction and motivation of group members, and enhanced acceptance of the group leader by group members (Hoy and Miskel, 1987).

Studies indicate that women administrators, successful or not, are constrained by cultural definitions of appropriate behavior (Marshall, 1980; LaBella and Leach, 1983; Horner, 1970). In fact, since men and women are viewed as different and unequal in many

ways, with the characteristics and behavior associated with men more valued than characteristics associated with women (Northcraft and Gutek, 1993; Kanter, 1977; LaBella and Leach, 1983), it can be assumed that the definition of success for women may be quite different than it is for men in the perceptions of those with whom they work. Belenky et al (1986) cite extensive research on sex differences indicating that girls and women find it more difficult than boys and men to assert their authority or to even consider themselves as authorities or as successful in their field. Griffin (1992) demonstrated that people perceive as successful those managers whose leadership styles closely followed gender stereotypes: males were rated more positively when they were authoritative and females were rated more positively when they were participative. Such participative behavior is perceived by many as "gender-appropriate" or a feminine characteristic (Tavris, 1992; Gilligan, 1982; Belenky et al., 1986; Porat, 1991; Haring-Hidore et al., 1990; Pigford and Tonnsen, 1993; Whitaker and Lane, 1990; Schuster and Foote, 1990; Brunner, 1993).

Realistically, women who wish to become successful administrators almost have to accept cultural prescriptions for "appropriate", or feminine, behavior (Curcio, Morsink, and Bridges, 1989; Offerman and Armitage, 1993), and thus should attempt to be resocialized by developing the skills necessary to gain entry into the male-dominant culture of school administration (Pigford and Tonnsen, 1993; LaBella and Leach, 1983). In other words, the successful woman central office administrator needs to acquire the skills—that is, the ways of talking, ways of dressing, ways of interacting, and ways of acting—necessary for success in the dominant culture while still validating her own identity and self-esteem (Duncan, 1993). Culturally mediated expectations also indicate that the woman administrator who exercises "power to" [2] appears to be more favorably regarded than the woman who uses "power over" [1] (Jacobs and McClelland, 1994; Brunner and Duncan, 1994).

**Leadership Temperaments**

An additional factor can enter into how a woman administrator is perceived by those with whom she works. The leadership temperament of the female administrator can affect how she is viewed by others. Keirsey and Bates (1984) hypothesize that leaders have distinct preferences in the way they perceive situations and reach conclusions about those perceptions. Perceiving is the process of becoming aware of things, people, occurrences, and ideas. Judgment is the process of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived (Myers, 1962). Together, perception and judgment govern a large portion of a leader's behavior because of their influence on decisions (Kurtz, 1991). One's temperament leads to a consistency of actions which results in a person's preferences for the way she responds or behaves. Using the Keirsey Temperament Sorter, these preferences determine leadership styles according to a person's temperament. Keirsey and Bates (1984) define temperament as:

> A moderation or unification of otherwise disparate forces, a tempering or concession of opposing influences, an overall coloration or tuning, a kind of thematization of the whole, a uniformity of the diverse. One's temperament is that which places a signature or thumbprint on each of one's actions, making it recognizably one's own. (p. 27)

Keirsey and Bates (1984) identified four distinct leadership styles using a combination of preferences derived from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Kurtz (1991) concludes that there are few leaders who represent pure types, but that most leaders will show a stronger preference in one of the styles. He cautions however, that it is best to view these as preferences rather than fixed traits.

The derivation of temperaments comes from scholars dating back to Hippocrates. The work of Carl Jung, Catherine Myers, and Isabel Myers-Briggs in this century help define these temperaments or personality types. Using the contributions of these scholars, Keirsey (1984) derived the four temperaments: the SPs or Troubleshooters, SJs or

Stabilizers, the NFs or Catalysts, and the NTs or Visionaries. The temperament theory is based on the principle of differentiation. The following brief and limited descriptions illustrate some of the differences among the temperaments in the capacity of leadership.

The SPs or Troubleshooters

Troubleshooter leaders need the challenge of problem solving and are extremely talented at negotiating or untangling messes. However, they have a tendency to ignore regulations and policies of any system they are in, preferring to march to the beat of their own drums as independent spirits. This tendency makes them somewhat unpredictable. Although they may be impatient with abstract concepts, they are valuable at overcoming obstacles to accomplish abstract mission statements. It is their ability to observe how a system works that allows them to find the breakdowns and determine the solutions. Troubleshooters handle concrete problems quickly and appropriately, using common sense.

Change is easy for Troubleshooter leaders as their temperament is very adaptable and seeks change. They are not the type that fights the system but works within it, changing what can be changed and not worrying about the unalterable.

SJs or Stabilizers

Stabilizers are the most dependable of all the leadership temperaments, creating a sense of trust and reliability in their organization. They set and keep deadlines, plan and are prepared. Stabilizers feel obligated and responsible to take on extra loads, wanting to be the caretakers or givers versus the receivers. This temperament is characterized by hard workers with a desire to serve and be needed. Stabilizers possess common sense and want their organization to be run by facts and well-developed policies.

Stabilizers' weaknesses are the pressures they put on themselves regarding work, feeling that effort creates success. They display impatience with projects that get delayed by complications, preferring to decide issues quickly, to get things clear, settled, and

wrapped up — in other words, stabilized. Routine, conservative, and resistant to change are words that describe the Stabilizer leader.

NFs or Catalysts

Catalysts are perhaps the most people-oriented of all the temperaments. These leaders focus on the people in the organization and on democratic leadership. They can become the hero for opposing groups since they can help members of both groups feel understood. It is the Catalysts' empathy and superior listening skills that make opposing groups feel this way. In addition, Catalysts have a tremendous store of energy, devoting that energy to their work and having little time for themselves. This tendency becomes one of their weaknesses as they neglect time for relaxation, allowing people to drain them of their time and energy.

Catalysts make good spokespersons for their organization. They display enthusiasm and can sell ideas to the public. However, they need freedom to create and manage as they become frustrated if they have to follow numerous standard operating procedures.

NTs or Visionaries

Visionaries need to be conceptualizing ideas in order to feel good about themselves. This leadership temperament must design and is energized when creating prototypes. They want to use their intellect to figure out complexities. Visionaries can envision what an organization will be like ten years from now and gain a following because the vision looks intriguing. They focus on possibilities.

Visionaries have enormous drive while creating the prototype, but once the design is complete, they prefer that someone else execute the plan. Since Visionaries are abstract people, they tend to get technical or present too many complex details in a short amount of time making it difficult for others to comprehend. They are the architects of future organizations, but not necessarily the best communicators when describing a plan. Visionaries are somewhat unaware of people's feelings, focusing on content and not

wasting time for small talk. They are often described by non-visionary colleagues as cold and distant.

Summary of Leadership Temperaments

The four leadership temperaments indicate preferences that are unique to each. Few leaders represent pure types, however most leaders will show a stronger preference in one of the four temperaments. The Troubleshooting leaders feel good when they are finding and solving problems in the organization. Stabilizers as leaders feel best when setting up rules, regulations, and procedures to serve their organization. Catalysts feel good when bringing out the best in others by being democratic leaders. The Visionaries are inspired when asked to create a prototype for their organization. Leaders in each temperament behave in a way to satisfy their desires, getting what they must have to make their own lives seem worthy.

**Research Objectives**

This paper examines the relationship between leadership temperament or style and the manner in which power is wielded by five women central office administrators and how this relationship in each of them contributed to how they were accepted and/or perceived by others as successful. The results of the study not only address that relationship, but also provide a framework for women in the central office or considering a move to central office—it gives some indications of what combinations of power use and leadership temperament are considered favorably by others and contribute to perceptions of women's success in central office.

**Research Methods**

The understanding of leadership temperament as it interacts with career success and the manner in which power is wielded is based on data collected in two school districts located in two mid-western cities. The subjects of the original study (Duncan & Rathmel, 1995) were five women who were in central office administrative positions other than that of the superintendency (two of the women were in "Shady Glen District," and three were



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

employed in "Sunnyside District"). The female administrative subjects were selected opportunistically, but also purposively because their circumstances in the two districts were quite similar: there are at least two women in the upper echelon administrative positions in both districts. This choice was an attempt to avoid the token, isolated female central office administrator. All five women were placed in their positions as a direct result of district reorganization which had been undertaken by each superintendent in an effort to "flatten the organization." In Shady Glen the women were placed in newly-created positions. In Sunnyside the women were selected for both newly-created and newly-defined positions. All five women were "insiders" (already employed in their respective districts before moving to central office). Although two had only been in the district five years before assuming a central office position, the others had been in their respective districts twelve, fifteen, and sixteen years before moving into a district-level administrative position. All five women had earned their doctorates. Four of the women were in their late 40's or early 50's and one of the women was in her early 40's.

The original descriptive, qualitative field study relied on participant observation, open-ended interviews (using a series of very broad guiding questions), and "non-interviews" (conversations centering on the issues of the study, as described by Lancy, 1993). The five women were first interviewed using broad guiding questions. Two of the women were observed in several different settings. Other informants interviewed were women and men who have worked directly with the five women who were studied. These ten other informants (five from each district) were selected using a combination of strategic sampling and purposive sampling. They were teachers, principals, classified personnel, coordinators, and district office administrators. The ten informants were also interviewed using broad guiding questions. At different points during the collection , analysis, and interpretation of the data, "non-interviews' were held with the five women in a sense of "reciprocity...give and take, a mutual negotiation of meaning and power" (Lather, 1991, p. 57). This negotiation of meaning involved the "recycling of description, emerging analysis

and conclusions" to the five women administrators (Lather, 1991, p. 61). Their reactions to the data were helpful in guiding the researchers' reflections on the themes emerging in the original study and in shaping the analysis and reporting of the findings in both the original study and this study.

To analyze the data for this paper, researchers read, reflected on, and re-read the interview transcripts and field notes, as well as the written results of the original study. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter was administered to the women administrators. Data from this instrument was added to the data already collected and compared with it. From this reflective, collaborative, and hermeneutical process, we inferred the relationship between the women's leadership temperament, the manner in which they wielded power, and the perceptions of others relative to their success and acceptance.

The theoretical perspective which underlies this study is that much of existing administrative theory is androcentric or male-centered in nature, and therefore is not relevant to women administrators' needs, not of value to them, and can even be detrimental to their purposes and their well-being. Charol Shakeshaft (1987) explains that educational theories or organization concepts developed within this androcentric framework are a result of imbalanced and inaccurate research and are not representative of the female paradigm. Although a research base centered around female administrators is taking shape, there is very little work focused on the woman administrator as a central office director or assistant superintendent. Thus, this study adds a relevant piece to existing knowledge in educational research and provides an opportunity for the improvement of practice for women in central office.

**Profiles of the Women**

The data collected on the women and from the women revealed, of course, that they were all quite different in the way they thought, their practices in carrying out their work, and the manner in which they dealt with people. However, the capabilities, experience, positions, and personalities of the women were similar enough to expect that those with

whom they worked would have similar perceptions about their power and success. It was not so. Some were regarded as powerful and successful and others were not. Some were regarded favorably and others were not. Of course, one has to consider that the five informants in each district may or may not have been representative of others' views in their respective districts; however, they did represent their own views and it is those perceptions on which the study is based. Additionally, secondary informants were contacted to verify or reject assumptions which were made based on the interview data taken from the five key informants. The following profiles will encapsulate 1) what the informants perceived about each woman, 2) whether each woman is "power over" or "power to", and 3) the leadership temperament of each woman as indicated on the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey and Bates, 1984).

Woman Administrator #1 - Stabilizer, "Power To"

This woman administrator is considered to have a great deal of power in her position. "She controls with a penstroke" what is going to happen. She is perceived to be decisive and to present her own opinion accompanied by her rationale and then ask for questions. She is considered a hard worker, "a real workaholic", and principals especially do not know how she accomplishes so much. A male informant said that there would be more pressure to get assistance if a male were in her job. She is considered to be organized, task-oriented, and discerning. Some informants did not know her well as she had not worked closely with them, but had heard positive comments from people who had worked with her.

The data collected from key informants and double-checked by secondary informants indicate that she is a "power to" woman. Although she reports that she loves to be in charge and to make things happen, she is willing to develop ownership in others. Her secretaries say that she teaches them and **let's them be in charge of what they're doing.** Some staff members tell her they love working with her on committees because when they sit down with her, **their opinions are important and they work**

**things out together.** She evidences extreme discomfort with "power over" concepts: "I'm a pretty quiet person in a lot of respects. I don't feel like I have to be aggressive. I'm assertive and strong, but I maintain a very low key approach to just get along with everybody, **not be threatening to them**...Power has a negative connotation ...**I don't like the word power**, because I think that if you're successful and if you're good, you don't need power." (Emphasis added by authors to demonstrate "power to" characteristics.)

As a stabilizer, this administrator fits the definition "dependable, factual, painstaking, routinized, thorough, conservative, consistent, detailed, hard-working, patient, persevering, sensible, and stable" (Keirsey, 1991, p. 10). In addition, she is "not impulsive or distractible, (is) good at maintenance, at citing cases, at meeting the visible needs of others" (Keirsey, 1991, p. 10. She strives for agreement and harmony among people. She also knows how to be tough when the situation calls for toughness (Lawrence, 1993).

Since stabilizers belong to what Keirsey and Bates (1984) describe as a "massive majority," this may influence them and others to assume that their views are the norm. Keirsey and Bates (1984) estimate three out of five teachers are Stabilizers. Most of their views receive general agreement not only from other teachers and administrators but from parents as well. According to the literature, parents who are the most involved with schools are Stabilizers. This may help to explain why woman #1 is well accepted by others even though she, as do other Stabilizers, enjoys being an executive and deciding what ought to be done.

<u>Woman Administrator #2, Catalyst, "Power Over"</u>

This woman is considered as a person who is very capable and people often say to her "I know you can get it done, so that's why I'm having you do it even though you're busy." She is regarded as being "very helpful, very forthcoming, has lots of information," although perhaps a bit too apt to cite others as authorities -- people would prefer her to be

more informal in her speaking patterns. There was no consensus among informants about the power of her position as some considered it to be powerful and others did not. Some of the respondents felt that she had moved into the central office position "by default," by being "a good little girl and just being moved up." She was told by one of the principals when she got the job, since she had never been a principal, "Who do you think you are? You haven't come through the ranks." A couple of the key informants indicated that she had not articulated a vision of what she wanted, although a double-check of secondary informants revealed that she had displayed strong visions of her programs and had brought at least two of the visions into being. Some of the respondents felt that she had not taken a significant stand on issues and hadn't done anything concrete. Again, secondary sources indicated information to the contrary. She was considered by some of the respondents to be task-oriented to the point of "not always taking into consideration the people she works with" and perceptions of her people skills were not complimentary.

The data indicate that she is a "power over" woman." She explains herself in part by saying she has "the wherewithal to know that things have to get done" and that **she sometimes cuts to the quick** and maybe has more high expectations of others. She also says that she may be **more assertive than others** and so has to use some of the skills she often sees men use, like joking around or charismatic behavior. For her, power is **knowing how to make things happen and influencing a lot of people**. She states that she **influences a lot of things** in the district and secondary informants confirm that. (Emphasis by authors to demonstrate "power over" characteristics.)

As a Catalyst, she is "enthusiastic, creative, imaginative" (Keirsey and Bates (1984). In accordance with Lawrence's (1993) characteristics of her type, she is an enthusiastic innovator, always seeing new possibilities and going all out in pursuit of these. She has a lot of initiative for originating projects, and a lot of impulsive energy for carrying them out. She is wholly confident of the worth of her inspirations, tireless with the problems involved, and ingenious with the difficulties. She gets other people interested as

well because she tries to understand people rather than to judge them. She is too independent and individualistic to be conformist, but manages to keep a lively circle of contacts as a result of her versatility. However, she does not appear to carry all the characteristics of a Catalyst in that others' perceptions of her are that she doesn't possess interpersonal skills and does not display charisma when dealing with people. However, she is quite people-oriented, seeking relationships and accepting individual differences which allows her to work with many types of people. As a Catalyst administrator, she is motivated by positive comments rather than negative ones and tends to see the positive in others and events.

Woman Administrator #3, Visionary, "Power Over"

According to one key informant, classroom teachers speak with great reverence and awe about this woman administrator, probably because of her knowledge base, credibility, and her ability to speak articulately and respond well to pressure situations. She is perceived as being a hard worker, task-oriented, with a high energy level. In addition, some of the respondents report that she seems to have a clear vision of what she would like to accomplish, and is able to organize others to accomplish that vision. There seems to be consensus that sometimes she makes decisions or takes action on matters that others do not agree with. It is generally conceded that she is sometimes directive, and that others' opinions aren't represented, although respondents vary in their agreement on the level of directiveness. Although she is regarded as powerful and successful in her position, respondents indicated that there are those in the district who do not admire her direct and assertive mannerisms. She is considered as extremely capable and bright. She is considered powerful enough that it is said that she speaks for the superintendent on some issues.

Although she does bring people of diverse opinions together and "gets them to come to some kind of consensus, work together," and she does have the ability to listen, she defines power as "the **ability to make things happen, and, conversely, not**

**make things happen,"** which is a "power over" definition. She has **a strong vision of what should be done** in the district and states that people believe she **has lots of ideas.** She agrees that she has **influence and power** when hiring decisions on principals are being made. She also stated that with secondary principals she had learned to be less **directive,** from which one could infer that she was **more directive** with elementary principals. In fact, one of the key respondents felt that she **had been in charge and very directive in some areas,** even though the direction that she had been going had been beneficial. Another respondent stated that she "has the ability to **push hard and to get others to buy into it**...and **keep them on task...she's consistent in pushing, pulling, whatever keeps people moving... .**" (Emphasis by the authors to demonstrate "power over" characteristics.)

As a Visionary, woman #3 is "abstract, analytic, complex, curious, efficient, exacting, impersonal, independent, ingenious, intellectual, inventive, logical, scientific, theoretical, research oriented, systematic" (Keirsey and Bates, 1984, p. 10). She exhibits other characteristics of Visionaries because she likes to design programs, because she has a vision, and because she likes to create prototypes. She is bright and uses her intellect to figure out the complexities of the district. She envisions what the organization will be like in the future and has gained respect and a willingness to follow because her vision is intriguing and convincing. She knows what can and should be changed and has set about to make it happen. Lawrence (1993) states that her temperament type is logical, critical, decisive, determined, and often stubborn, tending to drive others almost as hard as they drive themselves. He also states that Visionaries have a tendency to ignore the views and feelings of those who don't agree with them. Some may find a Visionary "cold and distant and may have difficulty in approaching him" (Keirsey and Bates, 1984, p. 146). Visionaries are not ones for small talk. They can become isolated from other activities in the organization, interacting only when it is business. Nevertheless, Visionaries, as is the

case with woman #3, are apt to be effective, relentless reorganizers, and efficient executives, rich in ideas.

Woman Administrator #4, Catalyst, "Power Over"

This woman is described by some of the respondents as bright, capable, talented, with a great deal of knowledge and a good network. She is regarded as having a high energy level and being a hard worker. She is seen by some respondents as naturally having "the ability to come to consensus and be happy about it when it's over....not necessarily force or crack the whip, her approach is very much 'Come along here, let's look at this, I think we can come to some...' a much softer approach...but also successful." Respondents agree that she is verbal and some say that she has a tendency to stray away from the task while giving lots of verbal detail. She is seen by several respondents as operating in a desirable manner, with an in-depth presentation of facts, etc. to help participants in the meeting make up their mind. One key respondent said "she is just very top quality" and the way she handles teachers, administrators, and parents within a group meeting situation, even very difficult ones, is very diplomatic. One of the researchers observed first-hand this administrator's effective diplomacy in dealing with an irate parent.

This administrator is a "power over" woman mainly from her own definition of power and because of one or two anecdotes told by secondary respondents. She defined power as "**being able to influence final decisions in the direction you'd like to see it.**" She also talks about **having the authority to "get people to the table"** and **having access to the building level administrators as their supervisor** as indicators of power. Additionally, she spoke of persons in power as being able to **extend their influence** beyond their formal position. She also spoke of power as **delivering and getting things done for people** in the organization. However, she also mentioned that "another means of checking if someone is powerful is whether they can share that power with others." Although she is generally regarded as a consensus-builder,



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

there was at least one instance where she was considered as **having come to a meeting with a directive and not accepting others' opinions.** (Emphasis by authors to demonstrate characteristics of "power over".)

As a Catalyst, she has all the qualities mentioned in the profile of woman #2. In addition, she is concerned with people and quite skillful in handling them. She handles her dealing with other people in a friendly and relaxed environment with humor, goodwill, and a minimum of interpersonal conflict (Tieger and Barron-Tieger, 1992). She generally establishes rapport with others and makes people feel comfortable with her.

Woman #5, Visionary/Catalyst, "Power Over"

This woman is considered powerful and successful by some respondents and not by others. Reasons given as to why she was not considered successful were her indecisiveness and her insistence on using process to make decisions. However, at least one other respondent thought that her skills as a facilitator, listening to all points of view and allowing discussion, were indicators of her power and success—"Kind of a subtle power. Power to draw people out, power to include people, to get them to take risks together, to get them to have a vision together and work out all the details of it." She was seen by a couple of the respondents as not accomplishing much, again mentioning that she was very much process and consensus oriented which is very slow. One of the respondents noted that she did not make it evident that she was the boss, did not tell newly-hired persons that she was their supervisor, and never gave direction nor delegated. Other respondents felt that the position and the experience of this woman provided her with the power to affect peoples' lives very positively, but that her approach was too narrow to carry it off. She was seen as driven but calm in her approach and comfortable to talk to personally, although one respondent felt that she lacked in interpersonal skills. Another respondent mentioned that the demands of her position would make it difficult for anyone to be successful and "we no sooner put somebody in a position of responsibility than

somebody starts trying to figure out what's wrong with it instead of saying I trust that person."

It may be somewhat difficult to see from the preceding examples why this woman is considered "power over." Our assessment of her orientation to power comes mainly from her own definition and discussion of power. She defined power as **being able to make things happen**. She felt unpowerful because **"The buck did not stop with me....I felt like I was at somebody's beck and call; I felt like I was doing things for other people; I felt like I always had to answer to someone else..I didn't have the autonomy I had as a building principal."** She talked about powerful principals in the district as those who **made up their own minds about things**. She did feel however, that her true nature of being "power over" was undermined by her position, a position she did not consider to have power because it was a staff rather than a line position in a "flattened" organization. She stated that the positions of most of the administrators in district office were expected to be service positions, "Well, service people don't make things happen. Service people serve. They serve, purely and simply...So I really had a conflicting role and didn't realize it till it was all over, and the crying had all been done....I was not quite astute enough to see that being service oriented was in direct conflict with what I was supposed to be doing in my position, which was **to bring about change according to my vision.**" (Emphasis added by authors to demonstrate "power over" characteristics.)

The fact that her leadership temperament appears to be both Visionary and Catalyst may indicate the conflict she felt between her position and the role she was expected to play. Visionaries don't answer to someone else, they have a strong vision and go after it. She at one point expressed that she didn't know what she wanted to do as far as her area went. As a Visionary, she evidences all of the characteristics of woman #3; however, Keirsey and Bates (1984) cite the claim Myers makes: Visionaries are quite unique and their core traits do not overlap with the other three temperaments. One of the additional

Visionary characteristics which can be attributed to woman #5 and not to woman #3 is that Visionaries tend to get too technical in the way they talk and often lose their audience. They are the architect but not necessarily the best communicator, as they may present too many complex details in too short a time for people to comprehend. Visionaries also have the tendency not to repeat what they have said as they assume everyone understands it the first time. Lawrence (1993) states they are more interested in reaching solutions than in putting them into practice, which others can do as well and this is representative of woman #5. She differs from the other two Catalysts in that her temperament type tends to have a wealth of warmth and enthusiasm which may not show until they know you well. Their deepest feelings are seldom expressed, since their tenderness and passionate conviction are masked by their quiet reserve (Lawrence, 1993, p. A-12).

**Conclusions: Who Am I? Really?**

*I'm finding the interviews with these women to be interesting. When describing someone as successful, they describe* ***all*** *the leadership temperaments. It is impossible for a person to be all the temperaments, so it must be extremely frustrating for them to attempt to be all.*

*Skarstad*

The most obvious conclusion that emerged as we read, analyzed, and reflected upon the data, was based on the conflict among the temperament types as interpreted from the definitions of success that the five women gave. All of the women described characteristics from all four temperaments as those characteristics needed for a woman administrator to be considered successful:

- be a team player with interpersonal skills (Catalyst)
- have a vision, take initiative, step forward (Visionary)
- be a planner, gather information and make decisions (Stabilizer)
- take steps in implementation, not take things too seriously (Troubleshooter)

Administrator #3 stated, "You have to be both a detail-oriented (Stabilizer) individual as well as a global (Catalyst) individual. You have to be able to work with people and motivate them (Catalyst) on a broad ideal or vision of where you are going (Visionary)...sometimes to realize that something is more critical, that you can move on...not taking things too seriously (Troubleshooter)."

The question is: "How can one woman administrator be all, do all those things?" The answer is: "She probably can't." The academic study of and research on temperament or psychological type indicate that each person has one true type and that type does not change as one focuses on developing different mental processes at different stages of one's life (Hall & Nordby, 1973; Sharp, 1987). Behaviors can change, of course, but the roots of them remain the same. Considering this, the best course a woman administrator can take to be considered successful is to create alliances with those who have characteristics of the other types.

As Skarstad (1994) noted, the weaknesses of one type of temperament are complemented by the strengths of another. The Visionary cannot be the perfect leader for a school district. The district also needs the Stabilizer who pays attention to detail, developing policies and making sure principles are followed. Catalysts are needed to be spokespersons for the district. Their skill in dealing with people is valuable in an organization and they make sure there is a consensus so others do not feel left out. Without Troubleshooters, any vision or plan may never become a reality. Their ability to solve problems in a plan keeps the procedure moving forward. A Troubleshooter's common sense in problem solving becomes important to the implementation of plans. Without a Visionary, planned change is minimal and the status quo continues. Their ability to design future plans is a necessity for a well-functioning district. Thus each type of temperament has something to contribute to the well-being of the district central office. It is not possible to have one flawless leader. Any team that does not have the four types lacks the potential to accomplish major change and improvement throughout the organization. It is important

that women administrators understand that they cannot be all of the types and that they should be true to their own type while forming alliances with persons of the other types.

The second conclusion that emerged from the data was that, at least for this case study, there were rather obvious connections between the "power over"/"power to" dichotomy and the four leadership temperament styles of the five women. Our strong Visionary, woman #3, was also regarded as a strong "power over" woman whose directive and assertive manner was often not looked upon with favor. We assert that her strong power over characteristics have their base in her Visionary temperament. The Visionary administrator knows her self-power and is so assured that she moves ahead, feeling no need to bring anyone along. She has ideas and develops systems and plans on her own without the benefit of listening to others' input. Even when she chooses to use the "power to" behaviors of consensus building and shared decision making, it will seem minimized in light of her powerful ideas and plans, which she devised on her own, after all. In addition, she will sometimes "seem" directive when she is trying to get her idea across. She sees only the big picture and as she attempts to tell others how it is, she lacks the specifics, and often the people skills to make the connections with others. As a result, she comes across as directive, "power over", and seems cold and distant.

Our Catalysts are all "power over" people and we contend that most Catalyst administrators will be so, because they achieve their power through people: by moving people, by motivating people, by getting the job done through people. They use "power to" methods because they understand what has to be done to move people. People who work with Catalysts often think they're in on the plan and part of the team, when what has happened is that the Catalyst has "sold" them on the idea. This selling or manipulation is actually a "power over" strategy.

Our Stabilizer is a "power to" woman and we offer that many Stabilizer administrators would be "power to" leaders. The Stabilizer, wanting to keep things calm and ordered would not be willing to offer new ideas that people would have a tendency to

resist. If the Stabilizer were to propose that something be changed, it would only be with a very good reason, because the Stabilizer is glad to leave things as they are. That very good reason would probably also be convincing to the others with whom the Stabilizer works, or she would find a way to present the proposal so that the water wouldn't be stirred. She might generally, in the manner of all "power to" women, simply ask people to identify their own problems and help them to find their own solutions to those problems, not interceding with her ideas, her vision, or her suggestions.

We realize the limitations that exist in arriving at such generous conclusions, since we have a case study of only five women on which to base such conclusions. We offer only that it is interesting to note that such conclusions can be made with these five women central office administrators.

Our biggest concern resulting from the study is the implication that so much is expected of our women administrators. Our contention is that such self-imposed and societally-imposed expectations would, if women administrators were to try to meet them, bring about administrative behavior that, at best would be personally conflictual and at worst schizophrenic. In any case, it would be an almost impossible set of expectations. And, yet, it is obvious from the interviews, that our women believe that they should possess and exhibit characteristics of all four types. It is also evident that those who work with them expect that they should exhibit characteristics of all four leadership types.

We are left with questions of significance for future studies. Do women central office administrators have to become different people than they really are at core? Can they remain true to themselves and be perceived as successful and powerful? Should they remain true to their core type or try to adapt so as to develop all four types? Are socialized expectations for women administrators unrealistic and possibly injurious for women in central office? These questions and others like them have jangled at our subconscious for some time. It would be nice to have the answers.....

---

[1] The ability of a person to convince others to do as she wishes through any means possible (Brunner, 1993).

[2] "The ability to empower others to make their own decisions collaboratively and to carry them out through a collective, inclusive model" (Brunner, 1993).

## References


Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Brunner, C. (1993). By power defined: Women in the superintendency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Canavan-Gumpert, D., Garner, K., & Gumpert, P. (1978). The success-fearing personality. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Curcio, J., Morsink, C., & Bridges,, S. (1989). Women as leaders: Moving beyond the stage of powerlessness. Educational Horizons, 67 (4), 150-155.

Duncan, P. K. (1993). Renewal: The story of a woman's first year in central office. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Gilligan, C. (1982). A different voice. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Gordon, L. (1993). People types and tiger stripes (Third edition). Gainesville, FLA: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc.

Griffin, B. Q. (1992). Perceptions of Managers: Effects of leadership style and gender. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Knoxville, TN, March.

Hall, C. S. & Nordby, V. J. (1973). A primer of Jungian psychology. New York: Taplinger Publishing Company.

Haring-Hidore, M., Freeman, S. C., Phelps, S., Spann, N. G., & Wooten, H. R. Jr. (1990). Women administrators' ways of knowing. Education and Urban Society, 22 (2), 170-181.

Horner, M. S. (1970). Femininity and successful achievement: A basic inconsistency. In Bardwick, J. M., Douvan, E., Horner, M.S., & Gutmann, D. (Eds.), Feminine personality and conflict. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Keirsey, D. (1991). Portraits of temperament. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.

Keirsey, D. & Bates, M. (1984). Please understand me: Character and temperament types. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.

LaBella, A. & Leach, D. (1983). Personal power: The guide for today's working woman. Boulder: Newview.

Lancy, D. F. (1993). Qualitative research in education: An introduction to the major traditions. New York: Longman.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern. New York: Routledge.

Marshall, C. (1980). Organizational policy and women's socialization in administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Northcraft, G. B. & Gutek, B. A. (1993). Point-counterpoint: Discrimination against women in management--going, going, gone or going but never gone? In Fagenson, E. A. (Ed.), Women in management: Trends, issues, and challenges in managerial diversity (pp. 219-245), Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.

Offermann, L. R. & Armitage, M. A. (1993). Stress and the woman manager: Sources, health outcomes, and interventions. In E. A. Fagenson (Ed.), Women in management: Trends, issues, and challenges in managerial diversity (pp. 131-161). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pigford, A. B. & Tonnsen, S. (1993). Women in school leadership: Survival and advancement guidebook. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Porat, K. L. (1991). Women in administration: The difference is positive. The Clearing House, 64, July/August.

Schuster, D. J. & Foote, T. H. (1990). Differences abound between male and female superintendents: Less coaching experience, singlehood and fewer children distinguish women from men. The School Administrator, February, 14-19.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sharp, D. (1987). Personality types: Jung's model of typology. Toronto: Inner City Books.

Skarstad, K. G. N. (1994). Reconceptualizing the role of teacher leaders: Collaboration among visionaries, troubleshooters, catalysts and stabilizers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK.

Taves, I. (1943). Successful women: And how they attained success. New York: Books Inc.

Tavris, C. (1992). The mismeasure of woman. New York: Simon and Schuster.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Tieger, P. D. & Barron-Tieger, B. (1992). Do what you are: Discover the perfect career for you through the secrets of personality type. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.